

094055

X



REPORT TO THE CONGRESS

Extensive Use Of Military Personnel In Civilian-Type Positions B 146890

Department of Defense

BY THE COMPTROLLER GENERAL
OF THE UNITED STATES

711161 094055

~~711214~~

MARCH 20, 1972

B-146890



COMPTROLLER GENERAL OF THE UNITED STATES
WASHINGTON D C 20548

B-146890

To the President of the Senate and the
Speaker of the House of Representatives

This is our report on the extensive use of military personnel
by the Department of Defense in civilian-type positions

Our review was made pursuant to the Budget and Account-
ing Act, 1921 (31 U S C 53), and the Accounting and Auditing Act
of 1950 (31 U S C 67)

Copies of this report are being sent to the Director, Of-
fice of Management and Budget, the Secretary of Defense, the
Secretaries of the Army, Navy, and Air Force, and the Comman-
dant of the United States Marine Corps

A handwritten signature in cursive script that reads "James B. Stacks".

Comptroller General
of the United States



C o n t e n t s

	<u>Page</u>
DIGEST	1
CHAPTER	
1 INTRODUCTION	5
2 USE OF MILITARY PERSONNEL IN CIVILIAN-TYPE POSITIONS	7
Military personnel being used in civilian-type positions	7
Personnel survey teams do not adequately consider civilianizing positions	10
3 AGENCY COMMENTS	12
4 CONCLUSIONS, RECOMMENDATIONS, AND MATTER FOR CONSIDERATION BY THE CONGRESS	17
Conclusions	17
Recommendations	18
Matter for consideration by the Congress	19
5 SCOPE OF REVIEW	20
APPENDIX	
I Letter dated December 3, 1971, from the Principal Deputy to the Assistant Secretary of Defense (Manpower and Reserve Affairs) to the General Accounting Office	21
II Additional examples of use of military personnel in civilian-type positions	25
III Principal officials of the Department of Defense and the Departments of the Army, Navy, and Air Force responsible for administration of the activities discussed in this report	27

D I G E S T

WHY THE REVIEW WAS MADE

Department of Defense (DOD) policy is that civilians will be used to fill all positions not requiring military personnel for reasons of law, training, security, discipline, rotation, or combat readiness or because of a need for a military background to successfully perform assigned duties

The General Accounting Office (GAO) reviewed the use of military personnel in civilian-type positions because, if DOD's policy were followed strictly, the departments could make greater use of military personnel in military positions and could hold military manpower requirements at the minimum needed to safeguard the Nation's security

Lower military requirements should make it easier to achieve the goal of an all-volunteer force

FINDINGS AND CONCLUSIONS

The five military installations included in the GAO review were using military personnel instead of civilians to a greater extent than that intended by DOD's policy. Installation commanders were reluctant to recommend the use of civilians in certain positions occupied by military personnel because of limitations imposed by budgetary restrictions and by civilian employment ceilings. Although the services recognize the benefits and importance of the stated policy of DOD, that is, using civilians in positions not requiring military personnel, this policy has not been followed consistently (See p 7)

In GAO's opinion, less than full application of DOD's policy has resulted from the failure of the military departments to determine which types and numbers of positions should be filled by military personnel and which types and numbers should be filled by civilians. Since these determinations have not been made, installation commanders must make subjective decisions concerning assignments. These decisions often are inconsistent with DOD's policy

Until the military department headquarters make these determinations and provide implementing guidelines to installation officials, there is every reason to believe that this condition will continue (See p 17)

The military departments have personnel survey teams which periodically review the management and utilization of personnel at military installations. The survey teams, as a general rule, have not adequately considered

whether DOD's policy on the use of civilian employees is being applied properly (See p 7)

In GAO's opinion, to monitor compliance with DOD's staffing policy by local commanders, internal review teams must relate personnel assignments to the guidelines provided by the headquarters. This can be done only if documentation supporting personnel assignments which deviate from the staffing guidelines is available for review (See p 14)

RECOMMENDATIONS OR SUGGESTIONS

The Secretary of Defense should direct that each military department headquarters review all types of personnel positions, except those designated as being in deployable military units having a combat or combat-support mission, and, for each type, determine whether

- The position must be filled by military personnel
- The position could be filled by either military personnel or civilians and the circumstances in which the position would be used for military personnel, such as for rotation or for career development
- The position need not be filled by a military incumbent and should be filled by a civilian

The findings of the review should be formalized in specific guidelines for use by all military installations in designating whether individual positions should be filled by military personnel or by civilians. Moreover, when personnel assignments that deviate from these position designations are made, justifications for such actions should be documented in official installation records, and such assignments should be for only limited periods (See p 18)

Also all conversions of military positions to civilian positions should be preceded by manpower-requirement reviews which will establish the need for the positions, which will give adequate consideration to the potential for reducing military support positions as such conversions are made, and, if appropriate, which will determine whether the functions involved should continue to be accomplished by Government personnel or by contractors (See p 18)

As part of the scope of manpower reviews, personnel survey teams should determine whether personnel assignments comply with the policy and the guidelines. Since the survey teams' findings can provide the military department headquarters with information needed to ensure compliance with DOD's policy, the results of the teams' reviews should be reported to the headquarters (See p 18)

AGENCY ACTIONS AND UNRESOLVED ISSUES

DOD did not agree that the lack of staffing guidance at the installation level was the major restriction to full application of DOD's policy on the use of civilians. DOD said that the principal constraints had been restrictions on civilian employment and budgetary limitations. (See p 12)

DOD believed that there were several measures which could, and should, be considered to encourage greater use of civilians consistent with DOD's policy. These measures are (1) a policy of assurance by the Congress that the funds and, if necessary, the civilian spaces will be provided for each military-to-civilian conversion and (2) authority from the Congress for the Secretaries of the military departments to transfer funds between appropriations to convert military jobs to civilian jobs as the opportunities occur. (See p 12)

GAO agrees that restrictions on civilian employment and budgetary limitations are constraints on the use of civilians. The Congress considers amounts to be appropriated annually for DOD on the basis of the President's budget requests, which include estimates of military and civilian personnel requirements.

Since military personnel costs and civilian personnel costs are funded in separate appropriations, GAO is recommending that DOD prepare and include in its future budget requests realistic estimates of the numbers of military personnel and civilians it intends to use. Unless these estimates are prepared within the framework of DOD's policy, it is not reasonable to expect the Congress to appropriate funds for the use of civilians and military personnel on a basis consistent with that policy. (See p 12)

Civilian personnel ceilings usually are established by the Office of Management and Budget. DOD must provide that Office with realistic estimates of the numbers of military positions that can be converted to civilian positions and with convincing justification of the numbers of positions needed to be retained to accomplish its mission. (See p 13)

MATTERS FOR CONSIDERATION BY THE CONGRESS

Substantial numbers of positions occupied by military personnel could be converted to civilian positions in fiscal year 1973. GAO recommends that, if the Congress wishes to permit early action on the substitution of civilians for an equivalent or greater number of military personnel, DOD be authorized to transfer such funds as may be required from the appropriate fiscal year 1973 military personnel appropriations to the appropriations from which civilians are compensated. A precedent for this authority was provided in the Department of Defense Appropriation Act of 1955.

CHAPTER 1

INTRODUCTION

At August 31, 1971, there were more than 2.6 million members of the Armed Forces and 1.1 million civilians in the Department of Defense. DOD's policy states that civilians will be used in all positions not requiring military incumbents for reasons of law, training, security, discipline, rotation, combat readiness, or a need for a military background to successfully perform assigned duties. In exceptional cases, such as for operational necessity, local commanders may temporarily assign military personnel to positions in which civilians can be used. In such cases arrangements are to be made to replace the military personnel with civilians as soon as possible.

By fully implementing the above policy, the military services can realize two major benefits. First, it will enable the services to assign as many military personnel as possible to combat-type positions and thereby to improve the ratio of such personnel to those in support-type positions. Second, in relieving military personnel from performing duties not requiring their services, military manpower requirements can be held to the minimum needed to protect the Nation's security. The lower these requirements are, the easier it should be to achieve the goal of an all-volunteer force.

During the past few years, several actions taken have had major implications for civilians within the Defense establishment. In fiscal year 1966 DOD initiated the civilian-military substitution program.¹ The program was short lived, and its objectives were only partially achieved--

¹GAO reviews of the civilian-military substitution (civilianization) program are discussed in two reports (B-146890) issued to the Subcommittee on Manpower and Civil Service, Committee on Post Office and Civil Service, House of Representatives. One report was issued on January 26, 1968, the other, on November 1, 1968.

114,200 military positions were eliminated and replaced by 90,000 civilian positions--when, on June 28, 1968, the Congress enacted the Revenue and Expenditure Control Act of 1968 which placed limitations on the hiring of civilians by Federal agencies.

The act of 1968 provided that no person be appointed to a full-time permanent civilian position in the executive branch during any month when the number of such employees was greater than on June 30, 1966. In implementing the act, DOD furnished the services with limitations on the hiring of civilians for full-time permanent civilian positions. The act was repealed by the Congress on July 22, 1969, and Federal agencies returned to the use of personnel ceilings established by the Bureau of the Budget (now the Office of Management and Budget) as a means of managing their civilian employment levels.

Acting on a suggestion resulting from our review of the use of civilian personnel ceilings,¹ the Office of Management and Budget agreed to eliminate administrative ceilings on civilian employment in DOD for a 1-year trial period. The purpose of this action was to assess the effectiveness of fiscal and program constraints on civilian employment levels. On January 6, 1972, the Secretary of Defense reimposed ceilings on civilian employment as a result of recent budget decisions.

¹See GAO report entitled "Impact of Employment Ceilings on Management of Civilian Personnel" (B-165959, Apr. 30, 1971).

CHAPTER 2

USE OF MILITARY PERSONNEL IN CIVILIAN-TYPE POSITIONS

The five military installations included in our review were using military personnel instead of civilians to a greater extent than intended by DOD's policy. Installation commanders were reluctant to recommend the use of civilians in certain positions occupied by military personnel because of limitations imposed by budgetary restrictions and by civilian employment ceilings. Although the services recognize the benefits and importance of using civilians in positions not requiring military incumbents, which is the stated policy of DOD, this policy has not been followed consistently.

The military departments have personnel survey teams which periodically review the management and utilization of personnel at military installations. The survey teams, as a general rule, have not adequately considered whether DOD's policy on the use of civilians is being applied properly.

MILITARY PERSONNEL BEING USED IN CIVILIAN-TYPE POSITIONS

To use civilians more widely in positions not requiring military incumbents first requires identification of these positions. This identification can be made only by reviewing all types of positions in the Defense establishment and by determining

- The positions that must be filled by military personnel, such as combat and direct-combat-support positions.
- The positions that can be filled by either military personnel or civilians, depending on existing circumstances. Such circumstances include designating at U.S. installations certain positions to which military personnel can be assigned (1) when they are rotated from overseas and/or hardship assignments or (2) for career development purposes.

--The positions for which there is no requirement that they be filled by military personnel

The military departments have not made these determinations, although in 1970 the Marine Corps did initiate a study to determine the number of military positions which could be converted to civilian positions. (See p. 9.) Moreover the departments have not provided field installations with guidelines to be used in deciding whether military personnel or civilians should be used to fill specific positions.

At the five installations visited during our review, we found that local officials were not applying DOD's policy to the extent intended. Local officials are reluctant to assign civilians to many of these positions because of restrictions placed on the use of such personnel by budgetary limitations and by civilian personnel ceilings established by higher authority.

Even if ample operating funds are available to pay the salaries of additional civilians and if civilian employment levels are below the personnel ceilings, local officials often prefer to use military personnel in civilian-type positions. Local officials are concerned that subsequent cuts in operating funds and/or personnel ceilings may make it necessary for them to release some of their civilians whose work no longer could be performed. This would affect the installations' ability to accomplish their assigned missions.

In contrast military personnel provide a stable work force in that (1) they are not affected by cuts in civilian personnel ceilings, (2) they represent, in effect, a source of free labor to the installations because they are not paid from base operating funds, and (3) they are available for emergency work levies, such as overtime and on holidays, without additional compensation.

During our review we found no trend to indicate that civilian positions were being abolished and replaced by military positions. We did find many positions authorized for military personnel that could be filled by civilians. Local officials agreed with our views on most of these positions but said that a shortage of base operating funds and

the existence of civilian personnel ceilings had discouraged conversion of the positions to civilian positions. Examples follow.

1. At the Security Police Squadron, Travis Air Force Base, California, 19 military personnel were being used in clerical or administrative positions. Base officials agreed that civilians could be used in 13 of these positions. The officials stated that placing civilians in these positions would release military security policemen for police-type work and would make more military security policemen available for overseas assignment.
2. At three Navy bachelor officers' quarters located at Pearl Harbor, Hawaii, 109 military positions were authorized to provide services to and housekeeping for officers using these quarters. Navy officials agreed that all 109 positions could be filled by civilians. A shortage of funds was cited as a factor considered in not having civilians assigned to these positions.

Additional examples are included in appendix II

In June 1970 the Marine Corps initiated a study to determine the maximum number of military positions that could be converted to civilian positions. At Camp Pendleton, California, 478 of the 2,351 military positions reviewed were considered to be suitable for conversion. We reviewed 394 of the positions that were not recommended for conversion and found that

- The decision that 205 positions could not be converted was questionable and/or was not supported fully.
- The decision that 87 positions could not be converted was based on improper criteria. For example, the reviewers concluded that 36 administrative positions should not be converted because they believed that civilians and military personnel could perform the tasks equally well.

As long as military personnel continue to be used in positions that do not require military incumbents, these

personnel will not be available to perform combat or combat-support duties. Moreover continuance of this practice (1) will result in maintaining the Armed Forces at a strength greater than necessary and (2) could create conditions leading to friction among, and/or affecting the morale of, civilians and military personnel at DOD installations.

PERSONNEL SURVEY TEAMS DO NOT ADEQUATELY
CONSIDER CIVILIANIZING POSITIONS

Each of the military departments has personnel survey teams that periodically conduct reviews to validate manpower needs and to improve the use of both military personnel and civilians. These reviews often result in the establishment of new staffing standards or in the revision of existing standards. These standards serve as a basis for revising staffing levels for specific functions throughout the military departments. The survey teams also review personnel operations.

Reports of personnel survey teams and discussions with installation officials showed that, as a general rule, the personnel survey teams were not giving serious consideration to substituting civilians for military personnel. We were told that, where civilian or military designations of positions were considered, the survey teams were influenced by the existing force structure and usually recommended retention of the military or civilian incumbent. Many studies were made of only one of several activities at installations, and economies available through consolidation of activities or improved utilization of manpower resources were not considered.

Instances in which personnel survey teams did not adequately consider whether positions should be filled by military personnel or civilians are discussed below.

1. In April and May 1970, a personnel survey team made a manpower study at a Navy activity at Pearl Harbor. During the study numerous individual adjustments affecting the number and rank or rate of military positions were considered. The team questioned the rationale behind the use of a military man instead of a civilian in only one of the 433 positions reviewed

2. Personnel survey teams made several manpower studies at Travis Air Force Base during 1969 and 1970. The studies were concerned with staffing standards and did not consider whether positions should be occupied by military personnel or by civilians. Installation officials stated that civilian occupancy of positions usually was considered during such studies only at the request of the commander of the unit being reviewed.

CHAPTER 3

AGENCY COMMENTS

The comments of DOD were provided to us in a letter dated December 3, 1971. (See app. I) DOD's principal comments and our related views are summarized below.

1. The Department does not agree with our conclusion that a lack of staffing guidance at the installation level is the major restriction to full application of DOD's policy on the use of civilians. The principal constraints have been restrictions on civilian employment and budgetary limitations, which are discussed fully in the report.
2. There are several measures which can, and should, be taken to encourage greater use of civilians consistent with DOD's policy. These are (1) a policy of assurance by the Congress that the funds, and civilian spaces if necessary, will be provided for each military-to-civilian conversion and (2) authority from the Congress for the Secretaries of the military departments to transfer funds between appropriations to convert military jobs to civilian jobs as these opportunities occur.

We concur in DOD's comment that restrictions on civilian employment and budgetary limitations are constraints on the use of civilians. The lack of staffing guidelines to installation commanders, however, contributes to less use of civilians than is implied by DOD's policy.

The Congress considers amounts to be appropriated annually for DOD on the basis of the President's budget requests, which include estimates of military and civilian personnel requirements. Since military personnel costs and civilian personnel costs are funded in separate appropriations, it is the responsibility of DOD to prepare realistic estimates of the numbers of military personnel and civilians it intends to use. Unless these estimates are prepared within the framework of DOD's policy, it is not reasonable to expect the Congress to appropriate funds for the use of civilians and military personnel on a basis consistent with that policy.

Civilian personnel ceilings usually are established for the departments and agencies of the executive branch by the Office of Management and Budget. It is the responsibility of DOD to provide realistic estimates of the number of military positions that can be converted to civilian positions and convincing justification on the number of positions needed to be retained to accomplish its mission.

Although the President's budget for fiscal year 1973 has been sent to the Congress, we believe that substantial numbers of positions occupied by military personnel could be converted to civilian positions during the year if DOD had funds in the proper appropriations. This could be achieved if the Congress were to grant DOD authority to transfer such funds as may be required from the military personnel appropriations to the appropriations from which civilian personnel are compensated. As noted in DOD's comments, a precedent for this authority was provided in the Department of Defense Appropriation Act of 1955 (37 U.S.C. 235).

If this authority is granted, DOD should obtain permission from the Office of Management and Budget to employ the civilians that can be substituted for military personnel as a result of such transfer of funds.

The need for staffing guidelines for use by installation commanders was recognized by the Assistant Secretary of Defense (Manpower and Reserve Affairs) in his February 22, 1971, letter, referred to in DOD's comments. In this letter to the military departments, he said, in part

"It is requested that you establish procedures to assure that local commanders are not placed in a position of having no alternative but to substitute military for civilian personnel in order to perform essential work."

In regard to staffing guidelines for installation commanders, DOD said that

DOD will consider further the need to provide specific guidelines to all military installations for use in

determining whether individual positions should be filled by military personnel or by civilians. Positions in the strategic and general-purpose forces must continue to be staffed with military personnel. Consideration will be given to the need for establishing staffing guidance for positions other than those in forces for which military incumbents must be provided. Some actions already have been taken

Because installation commanders may be unaware of rotation requirements, DOD does not consider it practicable to require commanders to document justification in official records for personnel assignments which deviate from staffing criteria.

We agree that there is no need for establishing guidance for positions for which military incumbents must be provided, such as positions in combat units of the strategic and general forces. This exception is covered clearly in the existing DOD policy.

As noted on page 13, the need for staffing guidelines for use by local commanders was recognized by the Assistant Secretary of Defense (Manpower and Reserve Affairs) in his February 22, 1971, letter to the military departments. On January 21, 1972, the Assistant Secretary requested the Navy and Air Force to consider the feasibility of providing staffing guidance to their installations for use in determining whether individual positions should be filled by military personnel or by civilians. He said that the Army had long provided such guidance.

If local commanders are to be held responsible for compliance with DOD's staffing policy, they should be provided with guidelines on the types and numbers of civilian-type positions to be authorized for military personnel for rotation, career development, and other requirements.

To monitor compliance with DOD's staffing policy by local commanders, internal review teams must relate personnel assignments to the guidelines provided by headquarters. This can be done only if documentation supporting personnel assignments which deviate from the staffing guidelines is available for review.

DOD commented on the examples cited in our report of positions authorized for military personnel that could be filled by civilians. The most common reason given by DOD for using military personnel in the positions was rotation needs

We know that each military department can validate the need for specific civilian-type positions to enable the rotation of personnel between assignments overseas and assignments at installations in the United States. Until each service determines its total needs for rotation purposes by skill and occupation and assigns to each command its share of the total positions to be used for rotation, however, it does not seem reasonable to conclude that any specific positions at any installation should be earmarked for this purpose.

DOD's comments indicate agreement with our view that the determination of those positions which must be reserved for rotation purposes can be made only at the military department headquarters, since only at that level can the changing personnel inventories be matched with overseas personnel requirements. This is significant since rotation needs so often are cited at the local level and at departmental headquarters as the reasons for using military personnel in positions that could be filled by civilians

DOD did not agree with our finding that personnel survey teams, as a general rule, were not giving serious consideration to substituting civilians for military personnel. It is DOD's view that

These teams routinely review the staffing practices of installation commanders and report their findings to the military department or major command headquarters. Additional emphasis on the function of these and similar teams, however, might be needed. An initial step has been taken to emphasize identification of the arbitrary use of military personnel in positions suitable for civilians. Further action is being considered.

We agree that personnel survey teams at the installations visited routinely reviewed the staffing practices of installation commanders. Reports on surveys and discussions

with officials at the installations showed, however, that the survey teams generally did not consider whether DOD's policy on the use of military personnel was being followed.

In a January 25, 1972, memorandum, the Assistant Secretary of Defense (Manpower and Reserve Affairs) expressed his concern that DOD officials knew too little about how well or how poorly their programs, systems, and policies met the needs of field commanders. He requested that more emphasis be placed on audits of manpower utilization practices of field activities by internal audit groups and by manpower survey teams.

CHAPTER 4

CONCLUSIONS, RECOMMENDATIONS, AND

MATTER FOR CONSIDERATION BY THE CONGRESS

CONCLUSIONS

DOD's policy on the use of civilians presents the military departments with an opportunity to realize substantial benefits in the management and use of DOD's manpower resources. This policy provides a means of increasing the use of military personnel in military positions and of holding military manpower requirements at the minimum level needed to safeguard the Nation's security. The military departments are not realizing fully these benefits because DOD's policy is not being applied fully.

In our opinion, less than full application of this policy has resulted from failure of the military departments to determine which types and numbers of positions should be filled by military personnel and which types and numbers should be filled by civilians. Since these determinations have not been made, installation commanders must make subjective decisions concerning personnel assignments and these decisions often are inconsistent with DOD's policy. Until the military department headquarters make these determinations and provide implementing guidelines to installation officials, there is every reason to believe that this condition will continue.

We believe that the personnel survey teams could provide valuable assistance to the military departments in monitoring compliance with DOD's policy. This could be accomplished by determining, as a part of their manpower reviews, whether personnel assignments at military installations comply with the policy.

We believe that the actions being considered by DOD to provide specific guidelines to all military installations and to emphasize the function of personnel survey teams could result in increased application of its existing policy. We believe also that these actions will not be fully effective unless DOD requires the military departments to establish controls at the headquarters level over those positions

reserved for military personnel that cannot be justified for combat-readiness purposes.

RECOMMENDATIONS

We recommend that the Secretary of Defense direct that each military department headquarters review all types of personnel positions, except those designated as being in deployable military units having a combat or combat-support mission, and, for each type, determine whether.

- The position must be filled by military personnel.
- The position could be filled by either military personnel or civilians and the circumstances in which the position would be used for military personnel, such as for rotation or for career development
- The position need not be filled by a military incumbent and should be filled by a civilian.

The findings of the review should be formalized in specific guidelines for use by all military installations in designating whether individual positions should be filled by military personnel or by civilians. Moreover, when personnel assignments that deviate from these position designations are made, justifications for such actions should be documented in official installation records and such assignments should be for only limited periods. Also all conversions of military positions to civilian positions should be preceded by manpower requirement reviews which will establish the need for the positions, which will give adequate consideration to the potential for reducing military support positions as such conversions are made, and, if appropriate, which will determine whether the functions involved should continue to be accomplished by Government personnel or by contractors.

We recommend also that, as part of the scope of manpower reviews, personnel survey teams determine whether personnel assignments comply with the policy and the guidelines. Since the survey teams' findings can provide the military department headquarters with information needed to ensure compliance with DOD's policy, the results of the teams' reviews should be reported to the headquarters.

We recommend further that, to obtain from the Congress funds in the proper appropriations in future years, the Secretary of Defense direct the military departments to prepare and include in their budget requests realistic estimates of the numbers and cost of military personnel and civilians they plan to use in noncombat functions in compliance with DOD's policy

MATTER FOR CONSIDERATION BY THE CONGRESS

We recommend that, if the Congress wishes to permit early action on the substitution of civilians for an equivalent or greater number of military personnel, DOD be authorized to transfer such funds as may be required from the appropriate fiscal year 1973 military personnel appropriations to the appropriations from which civilians are compensated.

CHAPTER 5

SCOPE OF REVIEW

Our review was made during fiscal year 1971 at selected organizations of the following military installations.

Fort Carson, Colorado
Naval Training Center, Great Lakes, Illinois
Naval Activities, Pearl Harbor, Hawaii
Travis Air Force Base, California
Marine Corps Base, Camp Pendleton, California

We reviewed DOD directives and instructions relating to the assignment and utilization of personnel. At the installations visited, we reviewed such documents as we deemed necessary to permit us to evaluate the manner in which these directives and instructions were being carried out. Installation officials were apprised of our findings concerning positions filled by military personnel which, under existing DOD policy, should be occupied by civilians. We obtained from these officials either their concurrence in our findings or their reasons for believing that certain of the positions should not be converted to civilian positions.

Copies of reports prepared by personnel survey teams were obtained, reviewed, and discussed with installation officials, to determine the extent to which conversion of military positions to civilian positions was considered during the teams' reviews.



MANPOWER AND
RESERVE AFFAIRS

ASSISTANT SECRETARY OF DEFENSE
WASHINGTON D C 20301

3 DEC 1971

Mr. Forrest R. Browne
Associate Director, Defense Division
United States General Accounting Office
Washington, D. C 20548

Dear Mr. Browne

We have considered the findings and recommendations contained in the draft GAO Report, "Extensive Use of Military Personnel in Civilian-Type Positions" (OSD Case #3317). Our comments, on behalf of the Secretary of Defense, appear below.

The Report cites instances found at five installations of military personnel being used in civilian-type jobs to a greater extent than intended by DoD policy, and concludes that this results from a lack of staffing guidance and ineffective control and monitoring procedures. To correct these deficiencies, GAO recommends that the Secretary of Defense designate each job in DoD as suitable for civilian and/or military incumbency, furnish these determinations to installations as specific guidelines, and have survey teams monitor compliance with the DoD policy

Constraints to Civilianization in the DoD

We do not agree with the GAO conclusion (page 12) that a lack of staffing guidance at the installation level is the major restriction to "full application" of DoD policy on the use of civilians. The principle constraints have been restrictions on civilian employment and budgetary limitations, which are fully discussed in the Report. These constraints will continue to limit progress towards increased civilianization unless and until installation commanders can be assured of receiving the funds and if necessary, the civilian spaces, for each military position to be civilianized and also a reasonable certainty of retaining these resources as long as the workloads require them.

APPENDIX I

These are several measures which can, and should, be taken to encourage greater use of civilians consistent with DoD policy. These are (1) a policy of assurance by the Congress that the funds, and civilian spaces if necessary, will be provided for each military-to-civilian conversion, and (2) authority from the Congress for the Secretaries of the Military Departments to transfer funds between appropriations to convert military jobs to civilian incumbency as these opportunities occur. A precedent for this authority is provided in the DoD Appropriations Act of 1955 (see Proviso in Section 720 at page 18 of P L. 458 approved June 30, 1954) which reads as follows

"That, whenever, in the opinion of the Secretary of the Military Department concerned, the direct substitution of civilian personnel for an equivalent or greater number of military personnel will result in economy without adverse effect upon national defense, such substitution may be accomplished without regard to the foregoing limitation (i. e. , civilian ceiling), and such funds as may be required to accomplish the substitution may be transferred from the appropriate military personnel appropriation to, and merged with, the appropriations charged with compensation of such civilian personnel."

Staffing Guidelines for Installation Commanders

We will consider further GAO's recommendation that specific guidelines be provided all military installations for use in determining whether individual positions should be filled by military personnel or by civilian personnel. It is not necessary, however, that all personnel positions in DoD be reviewed to develop these guidelines, as GAO recommends. It is clear that positions in the strategic and general purpose forces (i. e. , in divisions, wings, air defense, and the fleet) must continue to be staffed with military personnel. We will consider, therefore, the need for establishing staffing guidance for positions other than those in forces for which military incumbents must be provided.

Some actions have already been taken. DoD Directive 1100.9 "Military-Civilian Staffing of Management Positions in the Support Activities" has since 1957 required management position staffing delineations to be reflected in staffing guides and similar documents. This Directive was reaffirmed and reissued by the Secretary of Defense on September 8, 1971.

Staffing guides of Department of Army implement these provisions of DoD Directive 1100.9. These guides specifically identify each position in the activity addressed as suitable for staffing with military personnel or with civilian personnel. These guides have long been available to and used by Army installation commanders and by manpower utilization survey teams. A brief extract of one of these staffing guides is enclosed. We will consider the feasibility of a similar system for Navy and Air Force.

The use of staffing guides should, however, be understood. They are designed to assist installation commanders in determining, among other things, positions suitable for staffing with military personnel and with civilian personnel. The guidance is not mandatory, principally because of the necessity to reserve billets -- which may otherwise be suitable for civilian staffing -- for the periodic rotation of servicemen from stations overseas.

The determination of which billets must be reserved for rotation purposes can only be made at the military department headquarters, since it is only at that level that the changing personnel inventories can be matched to changing overseas requirements.

Installation commanders do not have this overall perspective and therefore may be unaware of rotation requirements, as GAO auditors found. A number of the examples cited by GAO of the use of military personnel in civilian-type positions were instances of servicemen assigned to rotation billets (see enclosure).

We do not consider it practicable, therefore, to require (as GAO recommends) installation commanders to document justification in official records for personnel assignments which deviate from staffing criteria. Also, action has already been taken to control such assignments. The ASD(M&RA) asked the military departments on February 22, 1971 to establish controls over the authority of installation commanders to use military personnel temporarily in jobs vacated by civilians and to review cases where this existed so as to take early corrective action. A copy of this memorandum is enclosed.

APPENDIX I

Survey Teams to Monitor Compliance with DoD Policy

We cannot agree with the GAO generalization that survey teams are "not giving serious consideration to substituting civilians for military personnel." These teams routinely review the staffing practices of installation commanders and report their findings to the military department or major command headquarters.

It is agreed, however, that additional emphasis might be needed. An initial step has been taken and further action is being considered. The ASD(M&RA) emphasized the function of these and similar teams to the military departments on April 17, 1970 as an effective means to identify, among other things, the arbitrary use of military personnel in positions suitable for civilian incumbents. A copy of this memorandum is enclosed. We are also considering establishing a uniform system of surveys and audits which will redirect and focus these resources of the military departments toward improving our capability to evaluate manpower utilization practices in the field. Military-civilian staffing practices will be highlighted as one of the areas to be addressed.



Robert C. Taber
Lieutenant General, U. S. Army
Principal Deputy

Enclosures - 4

- 1 Sample page of Army staffing guide
2. ASD(M&RA) memo, February 22, 1971
3. ASD(M&RA) memo, April 17, 1970
4. DoD comments on GAO Examples of
Military Personnel in Civilian Jobs¹

¹GAO note The DOD attachments have not been included. Remarks concerning those attachments have been included, as appropriate, in the body of the report.

ADDITIONAL EXAMPLES OF USE OF MILITARY PERSONNEL
IN CIVILIAN-TYPE POSITIONS

The commissary store at the Pearl Harbor Naval Station was authorized 40 positions for enlisted military personnel but had 46 personnel assigned to perform commissary duties. These personnel were performing the same types of duty as were being performed by civilians employed at the commissary store. Installation officials agreed that all the positions filled by military personnel could be filled by civilians.

The Single Passenger Reservation Center at Travis Air Force Base schedules international air travel for all DOD personnel on flights made on military or commercial aircraft originating from the west coast. The Center was authorized 57 military positions and 37 civilian positions. Installation officials stated that 49 of the 57 military positions could be filled by civilians.

The Marine Corps Base, Camp Pendleton, requested an authorization for 13 additional civilian and 74 military positions to handle an increased work load at its data processing installation. Officials at the base stated that they did not request more civilian positions and less military positions because of civilian employment ceilings. In response to this request, the base was authorized 15 additional military positions and no additional civilian positions.

Two data processing functions at the Naval Training Center, Great Lakes, were consolidated into a single department in January 1969. The consolidation involved the transfer of 29 civilian positions from one function and 14 enlisted military positions from the other function. An additional position was created for a military officer to serve as director of the new department. The positions held by the 14 enlisted military personnel generally involved tabulating-machine operations that could be performed by civilians. At the time of the consolidation, no consideration was given to civilianizing these 14 positions or the position of the new director.

At June 30, 1970, 1,746 military personnel were assigned to garrison units at Fort Carson, which were authorized a total

APPENDIX II

strength of 806 positions. These units were responsible for performing administrative, maintenance, and operating functions (housekeeping-type duties) at the installation. Duties performed by most of these personnel could have been performed by civilians.

PRINCIPAL OFFICIALS OF THE
DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE
AND THE DEPARTMENTS OF THE ARMY, NAVY, AND AIR FORCE
RESPONSIBLE FOR ADMINISTRATION OF THE ACTIVITIES
DISCUSSED IN THIS REPORT

	<u>Tenure of office</u>	
	<u>From</u>	<u>To</u>
<u>DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE</u>		
SECRETARY OF DEFENSE.		
Melvin R. Laird	Jan. 1969	Present
ASSISTANT SECRETARY OF DEFENSE (MANPOWER AND RESERVE AFFAIRS).		
Roger T. Kelley	Feb. 1969	Present
<u>DEPARTMENT OF THE AIR FORCE</u>		
SECRETARY OF THE AIR FORCE		
Robert C. Seamans, Jr.	Jan. 1969	Present
ASSISTANT SECRETARY OF THE AIR FORCE (MANPOWER AND RESERVE AFFAIRS).		
Richard J. Borda	Oct. 1970	Present
James P. Goode (acting)	Apr. 1970	Oct. 1970
<u>DEPARTMENT OF THE ARMY</u>		
SECRETARY OF THE ARMY.		
Robert F. Froehlke	July 1971	Present
Stanley R. Resor	July 1965	June 1971

Tenure of officeFromToDEPARTMENT OF THE ARMY (continued)ASSISTANT SECRETARY OF THE ARMY
(MANPOWER AND RESERVE AFFAIRS).

William K Brehm

Apr. 1968 Present

DEPARTMENT OF THE NAVY

SECRETARY OF THE NAVY:

John H. Chaffee

Jan. 1969 Present

ASSISTANT SECRETARY OF THE NAVY
(MANPOWER AND RESERVE AFFAIRS):

James E. Johnson

Apr. 1971 Present

James D. Hittle

Mar. 1969 Mar. 1971

Copies of this report are available from the
U S General Accounting Office Room 6417
441 G Street N W Washington D C , 20548

Copies are provided without charge to Mem-
bers of Congress congressional committee
staff members Government officials members
of the press college libraries faculty mem-
bers and students The price to the general
public is \$1 00 a copy Orders should be ac-
companied by cash or check